

---

Serial No. 09/902,890

Leigh Allen Williamson

Page 10 of 11

**Section IV:**  
**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121**  
**REMARKS**

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2002/004850 to Sudarshan (hereinafter "Sudarshan") in view of US Patent 6,633,923 to Kukura (hereinafter "Kukura").

Sudarshan and Kukura deal with typical messaging services, and typical pluggable providers, albeit one of them in the CORBA paradigm and not in a J2EE environment. However, J2EE's pluggable providers do not include the messaging service (e.g. JMS), as JMS is normally configured by the J2EE server platform provider or manufacturer. While the messaging service must conform to certain functionality and interface definitions as required by J2EE specifications, it is normally not an item which can be "plugged" in by the end user. With many J2EE server platforms, only one messaging service can exist at a time – the one that the platform manufacturer configures into the system. In other words, each application server platform manufacturer builds their JMS provider "under the skin" of the server so that it is not pluggable by an end user, but rather is "hard wired" into the system using proprietary interfaces to the core of the server.

As such, without our invention, message providers in J2EE are not pluggable by the end user, they are installed or configured in a vendor-specific manner by the vendor of the platform.

While Sudarshan and Kukura deal with pluggable technologies, they deal with portions of computing platforms which are intended to be "pluggable", but not with the normally fixed messaging services of J2EE.

When comparing our claims to this art, one distinctive aspect is apparent – even if the technologies of Sudarshan and Kukura are combined in the manner as proposed by the Examiner, the application programs would only be able to access the single messaging provider on the platform, and could not access or use an alternate messaging provider through the indirect lookup mechanism we have enabled with our invention. In our claims as originally filed, we used the term "extension messaging service" as referring to a messaging service in addition to a default,

Serial No. 09/902,890

Leigh Allen Williamson

Page 11 of 11

pre-existing messaging service, not necessarily as a replacement of the default messaging service.

Therefore, we have amended our claims to clearly specify that our system provides an alternate messaging service (e.g. the messaging service the end user can "plug in" to the platform) in addition to a pre-existing default messaging service (e.g. the service configured by the platform manufacturer). Additionally, we have amended our claims to specify that an application program running on the server accesses and uses the alternate messaging service using an indirect naming service lookup through the application server's default context factory.

Sudarshan is silent as to configuring and accessing an alternate messaging service in this manner, and the term "context factory" does not appear in the disclosure at all. Likewise, Kukura is silent as to these steps, elements, or limitations, and the term "context factory" does not appear in their disclosure, either.

For these reasons, we request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1 - 21, as the combination or modification of the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not teach all the claimed elements, steps, or restrictions. MPEP §2143.03 states:

**All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested.** To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Additionally, motivation or suggestion to combine or modify the references in the manner which we have claimed is not found in the cited art. MPEP §2143.01 states:

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Neither Sudarshan or Kukura describe use of a context factory, and thus motivation to employ and indirect naming service lookup through the application server's default context factory as we have claimed is not provided by Sudarshan or Kukura.

###

Serial No. 09/902,890

Leigh Allen Williamson

Page 9 of 11

**Section III:**

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the  
DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.